

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

NEWMARK GROUP, INC., G&E
ACQUISITION COMPANY, LLC and BGC
REAL ESTATE OF NEVADA, LLC

Case No. 2:15-cv-00531-RFB-EJY

Plaintiff,

ORDER

V.

8 AVISON YOUNG (CANADA) INC.;
9 AVISON YOUNG (USA) INC.; AVISON
10 YOUNG-NEVADA, LLC, MARK ROSE,
THE NEVADA COMMERCIAL GROUP,
JOHN PINJUV, and JOSEPH KUPIEC; DOES
11 1 through 5; and ROE BUSINESS ENTITIES
6 through 10.

Defendants.

14 Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal. ECF No.
15 262. No response or opposition to this Motion was filed by Defendants.

16 As the party seeking to seal a judicial record, Plaintiffs must meet its burden of overcoming
17 the strong presumption in favor of access and public policies favoring disclosure. *Kamakana v. City*
18 *and Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 2006) (holding that those who seek to
19 maintain the secrecy of documents attached to dispositive motions must meet the high threshold of
20 showing that “compelling reasons” support secrecy). “Many courts have applied the compelling
21 reasons standard to . . . temporary restraining orders.” *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Group, LLC*,
22 809 F.3d 1092, 1096 n.2 (9th Cir. 2016) (collecting cases); *see also Selling Source, LLC v. Red River*
23 *Ventures, LLC*, No. 2:09-cv-01491-JCM-GWF, 2011 WL 1630338, at *5 (finding requests for
24 preliminary injunctive relief should be treated as dispositive motions for purposes of sealing court
25 records) (D. Nev. Apr. 29, 2011). The mere fact that the production of records may lead to a party’s
26 embarrassment, incrimination or exposure to further litigation will not alone compel the court to seal
27 its records. *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1136 (9th Cir.
28 2003). Compelling reasons require a demonstration of something more, such as when court files

1 have become a vehicle for improper purposes, including use of records to gratify private spite,
2 promote public scandal, disseminate libelous statements, or circulate trade secrets. *Nixon v. Warner*
3 *Commc'ns*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978).

4 The Court has considered Plaintiffs' Motion and the document sought to be sealed. The
5 Court finds Exhibit 13 to Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Directed to the NCG Defendants contain
6 confidential business information. Therefore, there is compelling reason for granting Plaintiffs'
7 Motion to Seal as to this Exhibit. The Court further finds that Plaintiffs' request to file an unredacted
8 version of Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Directed to the NCG Defendants under seal is also proper
9 under the standard summarized above.

10 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File Documents
11 Under Seal (ECF No. 262) is GRANTED and Exhibit 13 to Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Directed
12 to the NCG Defendants shall remain sealed.

13 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the unredacted version of Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel
14 Directed to the NCG Defendants shall remain sealed.

15 DATED: March 25, 2020

16 
17 ELAYNA J. YOUCRAH
18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28